

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR		ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/643,627	10/643,627 08/19/2003		Johan Sundelin	MP	MPI93-006CP1DV1ACNIDV1M 4455		
50446	7590	04/07/2006		EXAMINER			
HOXIE & TSO LLP					GUZO, DAVID		
374 MILLBURN AVENUE SUITE 300 E				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
	MILLBURN, NJ 07041			1636			
				DATE MAILED: 04/07/2006		6	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/643,627	SUNDELIN ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
David Guzo	1636		

•	EXCHINIO	A COME							
	David Guzo	1636							
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress						
THE REPLY FILED <u>13 March 2006</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	ALLOWANCE.							
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in c	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)						
time periods: a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	·							
	b) X The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In								
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN									
	TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).								
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b)	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origi r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropr inally set in the final Offi	ate extension fee ce action; or (2) as						
NOTICE OF APPEAL	liana with 27 OFD 44 27 much ha	Elad							
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th							
AMENDMENTS									
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, They raise new issues that would require further co 	nsideration and/or search (see NO		ecause						
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo		duales es almalifica	tha laguag fag						
(c) ☑ They are not deemed to place the application in bei appeal; and/or	tter form for appeal by materially re	aucing or simplifying	tne issues for						
(d)⊠ They present additional claims without canceling a		ected claims.							
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).									
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).						
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the									
non-allowable claim(s).	•	•	•						
 For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro 		II be entered and an e	explanation_of						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	vided below of appended.	•							
Claim(s) allowed: <u>46,47 and 53-58</u> .									
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 27,28,44,45 and 48-52.									
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:									
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		•							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 									
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome all rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fa	ls to provide a						
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.									
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•	*						
 The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	, ,,		nce because:						
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	lo(s)	_						
13. ☑ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .		A 11	Zun						
		DAVID GUZU PRIMARY EXAMIN	ER						
		.· ·							

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)

Application No. 10/643,627

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amendment filed 3/13/06 broadens the scope of claims 27 and 44, this would result in a further search and/or consideration of the claimed subject matter .

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Given the non-entry of the instant after final amendment, applicants' arguments directed to said amendment are moot. Applicants' other arguments are not sufficient to overcome the rejections because said arguments are not sufficiently new or different from arguments previously presented and addressed by the examiner in previous Office Actions. With regard to claim 44, applicants inquire whether the written description rejection previously made but apparently withdrawn in the last Office Action was still being maintained. In response, the examiner notes that the description rejection was not maintained because the functional limitation in the claim (being a C140 polypeptide) was removed by applicants' amendment filed 6/30/05.

Continuation of 13. Other: The Sequence Listing filed 3/13/06 is acceptable and has been entered.